

REMARKS

Amendments to the Claims

Claim 1 has been amended to recite "*a plurality of isolated islands distributed in the first doped region so that the resistance of the first doped region is increased, wherein at least one of the isolated islands is completely bordered ~~surrounded~~ by the first doped region*"; and claim 12 has been amended to recite "*a plurality of isolated islands, formed between the contact region and the first side of the gate structure in the first doped region, resulting in increased resistance of the first doped region, wherein at least one of the isolated islands is completely bordered ~~surrounded~~ by the first doped region*". Applicants note that the above amendments are supported by the application as filed, and in particular Fig. 2B and the corresponding portion of the specification.

No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1-3, 7-12 and 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 5,465,189 to Polgreen in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,621,133 to Chen et al. The Applicants respectfully disagree.

Rejection of claim 1

Applicants submit that, since the Examiner has acknowledged, in the previous Action, that Polgreen does not show "*a plurality of isolated islands distributed in the first doped region so that the resistance of the first doped region is increased, wherein at least one of the isolated islands is completely surrounded by the first doped region*", the Examiner will agree that Polgreen does not show "*a plurality of isolated islands distributed in the first doped region so that the resistance of the first doped region is increased, wherein at least one of the isolated islands is completely bordered ~~surrounded~~ by the first doped region*", as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Applicants further note that each of the two parts of the circumscribing shallow trench isolation region 32a shown in Fig. 7 of Chen have one side in contact with the first doped region 22 having a conductivity type (n+ type), and one side in contact with doped region 34 having another conductivity type (p+ type). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that none of the parts 32a of the circumscribing shallow trench isolation region 32a of Fig. 7 of Chen can be deemed to suggest an isolated island completely bordered by a single doped region (i.e. having all its sides in contact with the same single doped region), and that Chen can therefore not be deemed to suggest “*a plurality of isolated islands distributed in the first doped region so that the resistance of the first doped region is increased, wherein at least one of the isolated islands is completely bordered by the first doped region*”, as recited in claim 1 as amended.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that because neither Polgreen nor Chen disclose isolated islands “*wherein at least one of the isolated islands is completely bordered by the first doped region*” as recited in claim 1, no combination of Polgreen and Chen, would have allowed one of ordinary skill in the art to obtain the circuit recited in claim 1 as amended. Applicants therefore submit that claim 1 as amended is patentable over Polgreen in view of Chen.

Rejection of claim 12

Applicants submit that the above arguments with regard to claim 1 can be used to show that no combination of Polgreen and Chen would have allowed one of ordinary skill in the art to obtained a circuit as recited in claim 12 as amended, and in particular comprising “*a plurality of isolated islands ... wherein at least one of the isolated islands is completely bordered by the first doped region*”. The Applicants therefore submit that claim 12 is patentable over Polgreen in view of Chen.

Rejection of claims 2-3, 7-11 and 14-18

Claims 2-3 and 7-11 depend on claim 1 and claims 14-18 depend on claim 12. The Applicants submit that at least in view of their dependency, claims 2-3, 7-11 and 14-18 are patentable over Polgreen in view of Chen.

* * *

In view of the above, Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance and respectfully urge the Examiner to pass this case to issue.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees that may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, the Commissioner is authorized to treat this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Post Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on

October 5, 2005

(Date of Transmission)

Shannon Tinsley

(Name of Person Transmitting)



(Signature)

October 5, 2005

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,



Robert Popa

Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 43,010
LADAS & PARRY
5670 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 2100
Los Angeles, California 90036
(323) 934-2300 voice
(323) 934-0202 facsimile
rpopa@ladas.com